

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended. The specification has been amended to correct certain informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7, and 9 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2-4, 6, 8, and 11 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 8 and 10, and at paragraphs [0050] and [0061] of the specification.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Drawing Objection

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Figures 1-7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated.

Attached hereto are replacement figure sheets for Figures 1-7, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

Figures 1-7 have been designated as "Conventional Art."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Claim Objection/Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6, 8 and 11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims have not been amended because they depend from allowable base claims for at least the reasons asserted below, and are allowable at least for this reason.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,937,213 issued to Iwasa *et al.* ("Iwasa"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Iwasa fails to disclose every feature of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a first capacitor coupled between a gate and an active node of the transistor, the first capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite to a temperature characteristic of the negative feedback element.

The examiner asserts that Iwasa's capacitor C3 of Figure 13 and col. 13, lines 40-59 disclose these features. Office Action, page 3. Applicants disagree. Although a first terminal of capacitor C3 is coupled with a gate terminal of transistor Q1, a second terminal of capacitor C3 is not coupled to an "active node" of transistor Q1. Thus, capacitor C3 is not "coupled between a gate and an active node of the transistor."

Additionally, Iwasa fails to disclose any temperature characteristics of capacitor C3, much less a relationship between the temperature characteristics of capacitor C3 and the temperature characteristics of capacitor C1. Accordingly, Iwasa also fails to disclose "the first capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite to a temperature characteristic of the negative feedback element."

Iwasa also fails to disclose every feature of claim 7. Claim 7 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

a first capacitor coupled between the gate and a drain of the transistor; and

a second capacitor coupled between the gate and the drain of the transistor, the second capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite a temperature characteristic of the first capacitor.

The examiner asserts that Iwasa's capacitor C2 and capacitor C4 of Figure 14 respectively disclose these features. Office Action, page 3. Applicants disagree. Although a first terminal of capacitor C2 is coupled with a node of transistor Q5, a second terminal of capacitor C2 is connected to ground. Thus, capacitor C2 is not "coupled between the gate and a drain of the transistor." Similarly, capacitor C4 is not "coupled between the gate and the drain of the transistor."

Additionally, Iwasa fails to disclose any temperature characteristics of capacitor C4, much less a relationship between the temperature characteristics of capacitor C4 and the temperature characteristics of the capacitor C2. Accordingly, Iwasa also fails to disclose "the second capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite a temperature characteristic of the first capacitor."

Iwasa also fails to disclose every feature of claim 9. Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

a first capacitor coupled between the gate and the source of the transistor, the first capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite to a temperature characteristic of the parasitic capacitance.

The examiner asserts that Iwasa's capacitor C1 of Figure 13 and col. 8, lines 47-53 discloses these features. Office Action, page 4. Applicants disagree. Although a first terminal

of capacitor C1 is coupled with a node of transistor Q1, a second terminal of capacitor C1 is connected to ground. Thus, capacitor C1 is not “coupled between the gate and the source of the transistor.”

Additionally, Iwasa fails to disclose any temperature characteristics of capacitor C1, much less a relationship between the temperature characteristics of capacitor C1 and the temperature characteristics of parasitic capacitance in the transistor Q1. Accordingly, Iwasa also fails to disclose “the first capacitor having a temperature characteristic opposite to a temperature characteristic of the parasitic capacitance.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 7, and 9. Claims 2-6, 8, and 10-12 depend from claims 1, 7, and 9, respectively, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, and 9, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 12, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs